arXiv:1204.1149v1 [math.PR] 5 Apr 2012

On the longest length of arithmetic progressions

Min-Zhi Zhao[1], Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang University,
Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China
E-mail: zhaomz@zju.edu.cn

Hui-Zeng Zhang [2], Department of Mathematics, Hangzhou Normal
University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China
E-mail: zhanghz789@163.com

Abstract. Suppose that $\xi_1^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}, \cdots, \xi_n^{(n)}$ are i.i.d with $P(\xi_i^{(n)}=1)=p_n=1-P(\xi_i^{(n)}=0)$. Let $U^{(n)}$ and $W^{(n)}$ be the longest length of arithmetic progressions and of arithmetic progressions mod n relative to $\xi_1^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}, \cdots, \xi_n^{(n)}$ respectively. Firstly, the asymptotic distributions of $U^{(n)}$ and $W^{(n)}$ are given. Simultaneously, the errors are estimated by using Chen-Stein method. Next, the almost surely limits are discussed when all p_n are equal and when considered on a common probability space. Finally, we consider the case that $\lim_{n\to\infty} p_n = 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} np_n = \infty$. We prove that as n tends to ∞, the probability that $U^{(n)}$ takes two numbers and $W^{(n)}$ takes three numbers tends to 1 .

AMS 2000 subject classifications: 60F05, 60C05

*Keywords and phrases:*arithmetic progression, Bernoulli sequence, limit distribution, Chen-Stein method

---

[1] Research supported by NSFC (Grant No. 11101113) and by ZJNSF (Grant No. R6090034)

[2] Research supported by NSFC (Grant No. 11001070)

1 Introduction and main results

Limit distributions for the longest length of runs with respect to Bernoulli sequence have been investigated for a long time, see, e.g., [5], [6],[7], [8] and [9]. But what about the longest length of arithmetic progressions? Problems connected to arithmetic progressions are very important in number theory, see [10]. For example, Roth's theory says that every set of integers of positive density contained infinitely many progressions of length three.

Suppose that $\xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots$ is a Bernoulli sequence with $P(\xi_i = 1) = p = 1-q$, where $0 < p < 1$. Let $\Sigma_n = \{1 \le i \le n : \xi_i = 1\}$ be the random subset of $\{1, 2, \cdots n\}$ decided by $\xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots, \xi_n$. For any $1 \le a, s \le n$, define

$$U_{a,s}^{(n)} = \max\{1 \le m \le 1 + [\frac{n-a}{s}] : \xi_a = 1, \xi_{a+s} = 1, \cdots, \xi_{a+(m-1)s} = 1\},$$

which is the maximum length of arithmetic progressions in Σ_n starting at a, with difference s. Let

$$U^{(n)} = \max_{1 \le a,s \le n} U_{a,s}^{(n)},$$

which is the length of the longest arithmetic progression in Σ_n. We call $U^{(n)}$ the longest length of arithmetic progressions relative to $\xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots, \xi_n$.

For any $1 \le a, s \le n$, the numbers

$$a, a+s \mod n, a+2s \mod n, \cdots, a+(n/\gcd(s,n)-1)s \mod n$$

are different while $a + \big(n/\gcd(s,n)\big)s \mod n = a$, where $\gcd(s,n)$ denotes the greatest common divisor of s and n. For convenience, let $kn \mod n = n$ for any integer k. Define

$$W_{a,s}^{(n)} = \max\{1 \le m \le \frac{n}{\gcd(s,n)} : \xi_a = 1, \xi_{a+s \mod n} = 1, \cdots, \xi_{a+(m-1)s \mod n} = 1\},$$

and

$$W^{(n)} = \max_{1 \le a,s \le n} W_{a,s}^{(n)}.$$

We call $W^{(n)}$ the the longest length of arithmetic progressions mod n relative to $\xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots, \xi_n$. Note that $U^{(n)}$ is an increasing of n while $W^{(n)}$ is not.

In [4], the authors discussed the limit distribution of $U^{(n)}$ and $W^{(n)}$ in the case that $p = 1/2$. The results can be easily extended to the case that $p \neq 1/2$. Set $C = -2/\ln p$ and let ln denote the logarithm of base e. In [4], they proved that as n tends to ∞, $\frac{U^{(n)}}{C \ln n} \to 1$ in probability and $\frac{W^{(n)}}{C \ln n} \to 1$ in probability. Furthermore, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{U^{(n)}}{C \ln n} = 1$ *a.s.* and

$$1 = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(n)}}{C \ln n} < \frac{3}{2} \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(n)}}{C \ln n} \ a.s. \tag{1.1}$$

The authors also conjectured that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(n)}}{C \ln n} = \frac{3}{2} \ a.s. \tag{1.2}$$

In this paper, we will use Chen-Stein method to study the asymptotic distributions of $U^{(n)}$ and $W^{(n)}$ more carefully. In addition, the errors are also given. The limit distributions we get are a bit different from that in [4]. Next, we **prove the conjecture** and give more description about almost surely limits.

Set $D = 1/\ln p$. For any integer $1 < r \leq n$, let

$$\lambda_{n,r} = \lambda_{n,r,p} = \frac{n^2 p^r (p + qr)}{2r(r-1)}. \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$\mu_{n,r} = \mu_{n,r,p} = \frac{q n^2 p^r}{2}. \tag{1.4}$$

THEOREM **1.1.** (1) *It holds that*

$$\max_{1<r\leq n} |P(U^{(n)} < r) - e^{-\lambda_{n,r}}| \leq O(\frac{\ln^4 n \ln\ln n}{n}). \tag{1.5}$$

(2) *Let* $h_n = C\ln n + D\ln\ln n$. *For any* $a<1$,

$$\max_{x\geq aD\ln\ln n, h_n+x\in\mathbb{Z}} |\exp(\frac{-q\ln p}{4}p^x)P(U^{(n)}<h_n+x)-1| \leq O(\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln^{1-a} n}). \tag{1.6}$$

(3) *As* n *tends to* ∞,

$$\frac{U^{(n)}-C\ln n}{\ln\ln n} \to D \text{ in probability }. \tag{1.7}$$

(4)*Almost surely,*

$$D = \liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{U^{(n)}-C\ln n}{\ln\ln n} < \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{U^{(n)}-C\ln n}{\ln\ln n} = 0, \tag{1.8}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n\ln n}(\sum_{k=1}^{n}U^{(2^k)}+\frac{\ln 2}{\ln p}n^2) = D \tag{1.9}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{\ln n\ln\ln n}(\sum_{k=1}^{n}\frac{U^{(k)}}{k}+D\ln^2 n) = D. \tag{1.10}$$

THEOREM **1.2.** (1)*It holds that*

$$\max_{1<r\leq n}|P(W^{(n)}<r)-e^{-\mu_{n,r}}| \leq O(\frac{\ln^7 n}{n}). \tag{1.11}$$

(2) *For any* a,

$$\max_{x\geq D\ln\ln n+a, C\ln n+x\in\mathbb{Z}} |\exp(\frac{q}{2}p^x)P(W^{(n)}<C\ln n+x)-1| \leq O(\frac{\ln^7 n}{n^{1-\frac{qp^a}{2}}}). \tag{1.12}$$

(3)*As* n *tends to* ∞,

$$\frac{W^{(n)}-C\ln n}{\ln\ln n} \to 0 \text{ in probability }. \tag{1.13}$$

(4) *That (1.2) holds and*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{W^{(n)}-C\ln n}{\ln\ln n} = D \text{ a.s.} \tag{1.14}$$

(5) *Almost surely,*

$$0 = \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(2^n)} - C\ln 2^n}{\ln\ln 2^n} < \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(2^n)} - C\ln 2^n}{\ln\ln 2^n} = -D \qquad (1.15)$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n\ln n}\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n} W^{(2^k)} + \frac{\ln 2}{\ln p} n^2\Big) = 0. \qquad (1.16)$$

Next, we shall consider the case that the success probability is not fixed. Suppose that $\xi_1^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}, \cdots, \xi_n^{(n)}$ are i.i.d with $P(\xi_i^{(n)} = 1) = p_n = 1 - P(\xi_i^{(n)} = 0)$. Use $U^{(n,p_n)}$ and $W^{(n,p_n)}$ to denote the the longest length of arithmetic progressions or of arithmetic progressions mod n relative to $\xi_1^{(n)}, \xi_2^{(n)}, \cdots, \xi_n^{(n)}$ respectively. We have the following results.

Theorem **1.3.** *Assume that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} p_n = 0, \lim_{n\to\infty} np_n = \infty \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{2\ln n}{-\ln p_n} = b. \qquad (1.17)$$

(i) If $b = \infty$, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(U^{(n,p_n)} \in \{[\frac{2\ln n}{-\ln p_n} + \frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln p_n}], [\frac{2\ln n}{-\ln p_n} + \frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln p_n}] + 1\}) = 1 \qquad (1.18)$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(W^{(n,p_n)} \in \{[\frac{2\ln n}{-\ln p_n}] - 1, [\frac{2\ln n}{-\ln p_n}], [\frac{2\ln n}{-\ln p_n}] + 1\} = 1. \qquad (1.19)$$

(ii)If $b = 2$, or if $2 < b < \infty$ and b is not an integer, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(W^{(n,p_n)} = [b]) = \lim_{n\to\infty} P(U^{(n,p_n)} = [b]) = 1. \qquad (1.20)$$

(iii) If $b \geq 3$ and b is an integer, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(W^{(n,p_n)} \in \{b, b-1\}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} P(U^{(n,p_n)} \in \{b, b-1\}) = 1. \qquad (1.21)$$

If in addition $u = \lim_{n\to\infty} n^2 p_n^b \leq \infty$ *exists, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(U^{(n,p_n)} = b-1) = e^{-\frac{u}{2(b-1)}} = 1 - \lim_{n\to\infty} P(U^{(n,p_n)} = b) \tag{1.22}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(W^{(n,p_n)} = b-1) = e^{-\frac{u}{2}} = 1 - \lim_{n\to\infty} P(W^{(n,p_n)} = b), \tag{1.23}$$

where $[x]$ *denotes the integer part of* x.

The paper is organized as follows. In §2, the equivalent statements of (1.9) and (1.16) are given. The proofs of Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 are given in §2, §3 and §4 respectively.

2 Auxiliary Results

For clarify, we give a simple lemma that will be used.

LEMMA **2.1.** *Suppose that*

$$b_n > 0, \sum_n b_n = \infty, \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n b_k}{n \max_{1\leq k\leq n} b_k} = 1 \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$a \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{a_n}{b_n} \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{a_n}{b_n} < \infty. \tag{2.2}$$

Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n a_k}{\sum_{k=1}^n b_k} = a \tag{2.3}$$

if and only if for all $c > a$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n I_{\{a_k/b_k < c\}} = 1. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. At first, we shall prove the sufficiency. By (2.2), there is d such that $a_k/b_k < d$ for all k. For any $c > a$, let $A_n = \{1 \le k \le n : a_k/b_k \ge c\}$. Then (2.4) implies that $\lim_{n\to\infty} |A_n|/n = 0$. Hence

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^n a_k}{\sum_{k=1}^n b_k} \le c + \frac{(d-c)\sum_{k\in A_n} b_k}{\sum_{k=1}^n b_k} \le c + \frac{(d-c)|A_n| \max_{1\le k\le n} b_k}{\sum_{k=1}^n b_k} \to c.$$

The arbitrary of $c > a$ yields that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^n a_k / \sum_{k=1}^n b_k \le a$. This, together with (2.1) and (2.2), gives (2.3).

Next, we shall show the necessity. By (2.2), for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is K such that $a_k/b_k > a - \varepsilon$ for all $k \ge K$. For any $c > a$, let $B_n = \{K < k \le n : a_k/b_k < c\}$. Then for $n > K$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n a_k}{\sum_{k=1}^n b_k} &\ge c + \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K (a_k - cb_k) + (a-\varepsilon-c)\sum_{k\in B_n} b_k}{\sum_{k=1}^n b_k} \\ &\ge c + \frac{\sum_{k=1}^K (a_k - cb_k) + (a-\varepsilon-c)|B_n| \max_{1\le k\le n} b_k}{\sum_{k=1}^n b_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting n tends to ∞, we get that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{|B_n| \max_{1\le k\le n} b_k}{\sum_{k=1}^n b_k} \ge \frac{c-a}{c+\varepsilon-a}.$$

The arbitrary of $\varepsilon > 0$, together with (2.1), implies (2.4) and completes our proof. □

As an application of Lemma 2.1. Suppose that (2.2) holds. In addition, suppose that $b_n c_n > 0$, $\sum_n b_n c_n = \infty$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n b_k c_k}{n \max_{1\le k\le n} b_k c_k} = 1$. Then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^n a_k c_k / \sum_{k=1}^n b_k c_k = a$ if and only if (2.4) holds for all $c > a$. Particularly, by letting $c_n = 1/b_n$, we see that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{a_k}{b_k} = a$ if and only if (2.4) holds for all $c > a$. Therefore if (2.1) and (2.2) hold, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^n a_k / \sum_{k=1}^n b_k = a$ if and only if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{a_k}{b_k} = a$, if and only if (2.4) holds for all $c > a$.

Note that $n \ln n - n \le \sum_{k=1}^n \ln k \le n \ln n$. By Lemma 2.1, we have the following propositions.

Proposition **2.1.** *If (1.8) holds, then (1.9) holds if and only if*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=2}^{n}\frac{U^{(2^k)}-C\ln 2^k}{\ln\ln 2^k}=D\ a.s, \tag{2.5}$$

and also if and only if for any $1>\varepsilon>0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}I_{\{U^{(2^k)}<C\ln 2^k+D(1-\varepsilon)\ln\ln 2^k\}}=1\ a.s. \tag{2.6}$$

Proposition **2.2.** *If (1.15) holds, then (1.16) holds if and only if*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=2}^{n}\frac{W^{(2^k)}-C\ln 2^k}{\ln\ln 2^k}=0\ a.s, \tag{2.7}$$

and also if and only if for any $\varepsilon>0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}I_{\{W^{(2^k)}<C\ln 2^k-\varepsilon D\ln\ln 2^k\}}=1\ a.s. \tag{2.8}$$

3 The asymptotic distribution of $U^{(n)}$

Suppose that $2\le r\le n$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}B_n &= B_n^{(r)}=\{(a,s):1\le a,s\le n, a+(r-1)s\le n\}\\ &= \{(a,s):1\le s\le [\frac{n-1}{r-1}], 1\le a\le n-(r-1)s\}.\end{aligned}$$

For any $(a,s)\in B_n$, let

$$A_{a,s}=A_{a,s}^{(r)}=\{\xi_a=1,\xi_{a+s}=1,\cdots,\xi_{a+(r-1)s}=1\}\cap\{a-s\le 0 \text{ or } \xi_{a-s}=0\}.$$

Then

$$P(U^{(n)}\ge r)=P(\bigcup_{(a,s)\in B_n}A_{a,s}).$$

Let $I=I_{n,r}=\sum_{(a,s)\in B_n}P(A_{a,s})$. Then we have

$$P(U^{(n)}\ge r)\le I. \tag{3.1}$$

Set

$$B_{a,s} = B_{a,s}^{(r)} = \begin{cases} \{a, a+s, \cdots, a+(r-1)s\}, & \text{if } a \le s; \\ \{a-s, a, a+s, \cdots, a+(r-1)s\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let G be the graph with vertex set B_n and edges defined by $(a,s) \sim (b,t)$ if and only if $B_{a,s} \cap B_{b,t} \neq \emptyset$. Then G is a dependency graph of $\{I_{A_{a,s}} : (a,s) \in B_n\}$, where $I_{A_{a,s}}$ is the indicator function of $A_{a,s}$. The notion of dependency graphs can be found in [1],[3] or in §2.1 of [4]. Set

$$e^{(n,r)} = \sum_{(a,s)\in B_n} \sum_{(b,t)\sim(a,s)} P(A_{a,s})P(A_{b,t}) + \sum_{(a,s)\in B_n} \sum_{(b,t)\sim(a,s),(b,t)\neq(a,s)} P(A_{a,s}A_{b,t}).$$

Note that $P(U^{(n)} < r) = P(\sum_{(a,s)\in B_n} I_{A_{a,s}} = 0)$. Applying the Chen-Stein method, (see [2], [3] or Theorem 3 of [4]), we get that

$$|P(U^{(n)} < r) - e^{-I}| \le e^{(n,r)}. \tag{3.2}$$

Lemma **3.1.** *It holds that*

$$p^r \frac{(n-r)^2}{2(r-1)} - p^{r+1}\frac{n^2}{2r} \le I \le p^r \frac{n^2}{2(r-1)} - p^{r+1}\frac{(n-r)^2}{2r}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Clearly, $|B_n| = \frac{[\frac{n-1}{r-1}]}{2}(2n - r + 1 - (r-1)[\frac{n-1}{r-1}])$. It implies that

$$\frac{(n-r)^2}{2(r-1)} \le |B_n| \le \frac{n^2}{2(r-1)}. \tag{3.4}$$

Note that $B_n \cap \{(a,s) : a > s\} = \{(a,s) : 1 \le s \le [\frac{n-1}{r}], s < a \le n-(r-1)s\}$. We have

$$\frac{(n-r)^2}{2r} \le |B_n \cap \{(a,s) : a > s\}| \le \frac{n^2}{2r}. \tag{3.5}$$

Clearly, $I = p^r|B_n| - p^{r+1}|B_n \cap \{(a,s) : a > s\}|$. This, together with (3.4) and (3.5), gives (3.3). □

Lemma **3.2.** *It holds that* $e^{(n,r)} \le 9(n^3p^{2r-1} + n^2r^3p^{\frac{5}{3}r-1} + n^2p^{\frac{3}{2}r-1})$.

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= |\{(a,s,b,t) \in B_n \times B_n : (a,s) \sim (b,t)\}|, \\ c_2 &= |\{(a,s,b,t) \in B_n \times B_n : |B_{a,s} \cap B_{b,t}| \geq 2\}| \end{aligned}$$

and

$$c_3 = |\{(a,s,b,t) \in B_n \times B_n : (a,s) \sim (b,t), t = 2s \text{ or } s = 2t\}|.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 \leq \quad & |\{(a,s,b,t) : (a,s) \in B_n, 1 \leq t \leq [\frac{n-1}{r-1}], b = a + is - jt, \\ & -1 \leq i,j \leq r-1\}| \leq 9n^3/2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} c_3 &\leq 2|\{(a,s,b,t) : (a,s) \in B_n, t = 2s, b = a + is - jt, -1 \leq i,j \leq r-1\}| \\ &= 2|\{(a,s,b) : (a,s) \in B_n, b = a + ks, -2r+1 \leq k \leq r+1\}| \leq 7n^2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $|B_{a,s} \cap B_{b,t}| \geq 2$ and x_0 is the minimal number of the set $B_{a,s} \cap B_{b,t}$. Then $x_0 = a + is = b + jt$ for some $-1 \leq i,j \leq r-1$. If $x \in B_{a,s} \cap B_{b,t}$ and $x > x_0$, then $x = a + i's = b + j't$ for some $-1 \leq i',j' \leq r-1$. It follows that $x - x_0 = (i'-i)s = (j'-j)t$. Thus $t = \frac{k_1}{k_2}s$ for some $1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq r$. In addition, there is positive integer k such that $i' - i = kt_0, j' - j = ks_0$ and $x - x_0 = kst_0$, where $s_0 = s/\gcd(s,t)$ and $t_0 = t/\gcd(s,t)$. Since $i' - i \leq r$, $k \leq r/t_0$. Similarly, $k \leq r/s_0$. Therefore

$$|B_{a,s} \cap B_{b,t}| \leq r/\max(s_0,t_0) + 1.$$

Consequently, $|B_{a,s} \cap B_{b,t}| \leq r/3 + 1$ whenever $\max(s_0,t_0) \geq 3$. When $\max(s_0,t_0) = 2$, $|B_{a,s} \cap B_{b,t}| \leq r/2 + 1$. Actually, in this case, $s = 2t$ or $t = 2s$. When $\max(s_0,t_0) = 1$, $s = t$. We shall show that $A_{a,s} \cap A_{b,s} = \emptyset$

whenever $a \neq b$ and $B_{a,s} \cap B_{b,s} \neq \emptyset$. Assume that $b > a$ without loss of generality. Since $B_{a,s} \cap B_{b,s} \neq \emptyset$, $a + is = b + js$ for some $-1 \leq i, j \leq r - 1$ and hence $b = a + ks$ for some $1 \leq k \leq r$. Thus $A_{a,s} \subseteq \{\xi_{a+(k-1)s} = 1\}$ and $A_{b,s} \subseteq \{\xi_{b-s} = 0\} = \{\xi_{a+(k-1)s} = 0\}$. It implies that $A_{a,s} \cap A_{b,s} = \emptyset$ as desired. In view of the discussion above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 \leq \quad & |\{(a, s, b, t) : (a, s) \in B_n, t = sk_1/k_2, b = a + is - jt, \\ & -1 \leq i, j \leq r - 1, 1 \leq k_1, k_2 \leq r\}| \leq 9n^2 r^3/4 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$e^{(n,r)} \leq 2c_1 p^{2r-1} + c_2 p^{\frac{5r}{3}-1} + c_3 p^{\frac{3r}{2}-1} \leq \ 9(n^3 p^{2r-1} + n^2 r^3 p^{\frac{5}{3}r-1} + n^2 p^{\frac{3}{2}r-1})$$

as desired. $\square$

Similar as the proof of Lemma 3.2, we may show that for any m, n and $2 \leq r_m \leq r_n$, with $H = \{(a, s, b, t) : (a, s) \in B_m^{(r_m)}, (b, t) \in B_n^{(r_n)}\}$,

$$|\{(a, s, b, t) \in H : |B_{a,s}^{(r_m)} \cap B_{b,t}^{(r_n)}| \geq 1\}| \leq 9m^2 n/2 \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$|\{(a, s, b, t) \in H : |B_{a,s}^{(r_m)} \cap B_{b,t}^{(r_n)}| \geq 2\}| \leq 9m^2 r_m r_n^2/4. \tag{3.7}$$

Also we can show that if $|B_{a,s}^{(r_m)} \cap B_{b,t}^{(r_n)}| > \frac{r_n}{2} + 1$ and $A_{a,s}^{(r_m)} \cap A_{b,t}^{(r_n)} \neq \emptyset$, then $(b, t) = (a, s)$. Therefore

$$|\{(a, s, b, t) \in H : |B_{a,s}^{(r_k)} \cap B_{b,t}^{(r_m)}| > \frac{r_n}{2} + 1, A_{a,s}^{(r_m)} \cap A_{b,t}^{(r_n)} \neq \emptyset\}| \leq k^2/r_k. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (1) Lemma 3.1 and (1.3) imply that

$$|e^{-I_{n,r}} - e^{-\lambda_{n,r}}| \leq |I_{n,r} - \lambda_{n,r}| \leq 2np^r. \tag{3.9}$$

Let $r_n = [\frac{-2\ln n}{\ln p} + 2\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln p} + \frac{\ln\ln\ln n}{2\ln p}]$ and $R_n = [\frac{-3\ln n}{\ln p}]$. By (3.2), (3.9) and Lemma 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{r_n \le r \le R_n} |P(U^{(n)} < r) - e^{-\lambda_{n,r}}| \\
&\le \max_{r_n \le r \le R_n} \left(|P(U^{(n)} < r) - e^{-I_{n,r}}| + |e^{-I_{n,r}} - e^{-\lambda_{n,r}}|\right) \\
&\le \max_{r_n \le r \le R_n} (e^{(n,r)} + 2np^r) \\
&\le 9(n^3 p^{2r_n - 1} + n^2 R_n^3 p^{\frac{5}{3}r_n - 1} + n^2 p^{\frac{3}{2}r_n - 1}) + 2np^{r_n} \\
&= O(\frac{\ln^4 n \ln\ln n}{n}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

On the other hand, it's easy to check that $e^{-\lambda_{n,r_n}} = e^{-O(\ln n\sqrt{\ln\ln n})} = o(n^{-1})$ and $1 - e^{-\lambda_{n,R_n}} = 1 - e^{-O(\frac{1}{n\ln n})} = o(n^{-1})$. Note that $P(U^{(n)} < r)$ and $e^{-\lambda_{n,r}}$ are both increasing functions of r. Hence when $r < r_n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|P(U^{(n)} < r) - e^{-\lambda_{n,r}}| \le P(U^{(n)} < r) + e^{-\lambda_{n,r}} \le P(U^{(n)} < r_n) + e^{-\lambda_{n,r_n}} \\
\le\ &|P(U^{(n)} < r_n) - e^{-\lambda_{n,r_n}}| + 2e^{-\lambda_{n,r_n}} \le O(\frac{\ln^4 n \ln\ln n}{n}).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, when $r > R_n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|P(U^{(n)} < r) - e^{-\lambda_{n,r}}| \le 1 - P(U^{(n)} < R_n) + 1 - e^{-\lambda_{n,R_n}} \\
\le\ &|P(U^{(n)} < R_n) - e^{-\lambda_{n,R_n}}| + 2(1 - e^{-\lambda_{n,R_n}}) \le O(\frac{\ln^4 n \ln\ln n}{n}).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (1.5). □

(2) Let $r = h_n + x$. For convenience, set

$$\epsilon_{n,x} = |\frac{-q\ln p}{4}p^x - \lambda_{n,r}| = p^x\Big|\frac{-q\ln p}{4} - \frac{q\ln n}{2(r-1)} - \frac{p\ln n}{2r(r-1)}\Big|.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\exp(\frac{-q\ln p}{4}p^x)P(U^{(n)} < h_n + x) - 1| \\
\le\ &\exp(\frac{-q\ln p}{4}p^x)|P(U^{(n)} < r) - e^{-\lambda_{n,r}}| + |\exp(\epsilon_{n,x}) - 1|
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Since $a < 1$,

$$\exp(\frac{-q\ln p}{4}p^{aD\ln\ln n}) = \exp(\frac{-q\ln p}{4}\ln^a n) = o(n^{\frac{1}{3}}).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{x\geq aD\ln\ln n, h_n+x\in\mathbb{Z}} \exp(\frac{-q\ln p}{4}p^x)|P(U^{(n)} < r) - e^{-\lambda_{n,r}}| \\ \leq\ & o(n^{\frac{1}{3}})O(n^{-1}\ln^4 n\ln\ln n)) = o(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

It's easy to verify that

$$\max_{x>-D\ln\ln n+1} \epsilon_{n,x} \leq p^{-D\ln\ln n}O(1) = O(\frac{1}{\ln n}) \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\max_{aD\ln\ln n\leq x\leq -D\ln\ln n+1} \epsilon_{n,x} \leq p^{aD\ln\ln n}O(\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln n}) = O(\frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln^{1-a} n}). \tag{3.14}$$

Now (1.6) follows by (3.11)–(3.14).

(3) For any $\varepsilon > 0$, (3.1) and (3.3) imply that

$$P(U^{(n)} \geq C\ln n + (1-\varepsilon)D\ln\ln n) \leq O(\ln^{-\varepsilon} n). \tag{3.15}$$

On the other hand, by (1.3) and (1.5),

$$P(U^{(n)} < C\ln n + (1+\varepsilon)D\ln\ln n) \leq e^{-O(\ln^{\varepsilon} n)} + O(\frac{\ln^4 n\ln\ln n}{n}). \tag{3.16}$$

Hence (1.7) holds.

(4) By (3.16), $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(U^{(2^k)} < C\ln 2^k + (1+\varepsilon)D\ln\ln 2^k) < \infty$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. One then deduces from the Borel-Cantelli Lemma that

$$P(U^{(2^k)} < C\ln 2^k + (1+\varepsilon)D\ln\ln 2^k \quad i.o.) = 0.$$

It follows that for almost surely ω, there is $K(\omega)$ such that for $k \geq K(\omega)$,

$$U^{(2^k)}(\omega) \geq C\ln 2^k + (1+\varepsilon)D\ln\ln 2^k. \tag{3.17}$$

If $n > 2^{K(\omega)}$, then $2^k \leq n < 2^{k+1}$ for some $k \geq K(\omega)$. Hence $U^{(2^k)}(\omega) \leq U^{(n)}(\omega) \leq U^{(2^{k+1})}(\omega)$. This, together with (3.17), gives that

$$U^{(n)}(\omega) \geq C \ln n - C \ln 2 + (1+\varepsilon) D \ln\ln n.$$

Now the arbitrary of $\varepsilon > 0$ yields that $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{U^{(n)} - C\ln n}{\ln\ln n} \geq D$. Therefore $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{U^{(n)} - C\ln n}{\ln\ln n} = D$ by considering (1.7).

Let T_k be the longest length of arithmetic progressions relative to $\xi_{2^{k-1}+1}, \xi_{2^{k-1}+2}, \cdots, \xi_{2^k}$. Then $T_1, T_2, \cdots$ are independent. In addition, T_k has the same distribution with $U^{(2^{k-1})}$. By (1.5),

$$P(T_k \geq C \ln 2^k) = P(U^{(2^{k-1})} \geq C \ln 2^k) \leq O(1/k).$$

Hence $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(T_k \geq C \ln 2^k) = \infty$. By Borel-Cantelli Lemma, $P(T_k \geq C \ln 2^k \;\; i.o.) = 1$. Consequently, $\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{U^{(2^k)} - C\ln 2^k}{\ln\ln 2^k} \geq 0$ by noting that $U^{(2^k)} \geq T_k$. On the other hand, (3.15) yields that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(U^{(2^k)} \geq C \ln 2^k + (1-\varepsilon) D \ln\ln 2^k) < \infty$$

whenever $\varepsilon > 1$. Hence $\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{U^{(2^k)} - C\ln 2^k}{\ln\ln 2^k} \leq 0$. Therefore $\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{U^{(2^k)} - C\ln 2^k}{\ln\ln 2^k} = 0$. Furthermore, we can deduce that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{U^{(n)} - C\ln n}{\ln\ln n} = 0$ by the fact that $U^{(n)}$ is increasing. This completes the proof of (1.8).

Now we come to prove (1.9). By Proposition 2.1, we need only to show (2.6). Let $r_k = [C \ln 2^k + D(1-\varepsilon) \ln\ln 2^k]$, $V_n = \{(a,s,k) : 1 \leq k \leq n, (a,s) \in B_{2^k}^{(r_k)}\}$ and $\Lambda(n) = \sum_{(a,s,k)\in V_n} I_{A_{a,s}^{(r_k)}}$. Then it suffices to show that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda(n)/n = 0$ a.s. Clearly, $E\Lambda(n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} I_{2^k, r_k} = O(n^{1-\varepsilon})$ and $D\Lambda(n)$ is less than the sum of $p^{r_k + r_m - |B_{a,s}^{(r_k)} \cap B_{b,t}^{(r_m)}|}$ with $(a,s,k), (b,t,m) \in V_n$,

$B_{a,s}^{(r_k)} \cap B_{b,t}^{(r_m)} \neq \emptyset$ and $A_{a,s}^{(r_k)} \cap A_{b,t}^{(r_m)} \neq \emptyset$. By (3.6)–(3.8),

$$\begin{aligned} D\Lambda(n) \leq & \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} O(2^{-j}ij + 2^{-j}i^2j^3 + 2^{2i-2j}j^{1-\varepsilon}i^{-1}) \\ \leq & O(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j}j^6) + O(\sum_{j=1}^{n} j^{-\varepsilon} \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} 2^{-2k} j(j-k)^{-1}) \\ \leq & O(1) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-2k}(k+1)O(\sum_{j=1}^{n} j^{-\varepsilon}) = O(n^{1-\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

Then by Tchebychev's inequality, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(|\Lambda_n/n - E(\Lambda_n/n)| > \delta) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} O(\frac{1}{n^{1+\varepsilon}\delta^2}) < \infty.$$

The Borel-Cantelli Lemma yields that $\Lambda_n/n \to 0$ *a.s.*. Hence (2.6) holds as desired.

Finally, we shall prove (1.10). Let $c_n = [\ln n/\ln 2]$. Then $2^{c_n} \leq n < 2^{c_n+1}$. For any integers $1 \leq a \leq b$,

$$\ln \frac{b+1}{a} = \int_a^{b+1} \frac{1}{x}\, dx \leq \sum_{i=a}^{b} \frac{1}{i} \leq \int_{a-1}^{b} \frac{1}{x}\, dx = \ln \frac{b}{a-1}.$$

Thus

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{U^{(k)}}{k} \geq \sum_{i=0}^{c_n-1} U^{(2^i)} \sum_{j=2^i}^{2^{i+1}-1} \frac{1}{j} \geq \ln 2 \sum_{i=0}^{c_n-1} U^{(2^i)}$$

and

$$\sum_{k=2}^{n} \frac{U^{(k)}}{k} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{c_n} U^{(2^{i+1})} \sum_{j=2^i+1}^{2^{i+1}} \frac{1}{j} \leq \ln 2 \sum_{i=1}^{c_n+1} U^{(2^i)}.$$

Hence by (1.9), $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{c_n \ln c_n}(\frac{1}{\ln 2}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{U^{(k)}}{k} + \frac{\ln 2}{\ln p}c_n^2) = D$ *a.s.* It follows (1.10) immediately and completes the proof of Theorem 1.1. ☐

4 The asymptotic distribution of $W^{(n)}$

Suppose that $2 \leq r \leq n$. For any $1 \leq a, s \leq n$, let

$$\tilde{A}_{a,s} = \tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(n,r)} = \{\xi_a = 0, \xi_{a+s \mod n} = 1, \cdots, \xi_{a+rs \mod n} = 1\}. \tag{4.1}$$

Let

$$\tilde{B}_n = \tilde{B}_n^{(r)} = \{(a,s) : 1 \leq a \leq n, 1 \leq s \leq [n/2], \gcd(n,s) < n/r\}$$

and

$$A_1 = \bigcup_{(a,s)\in\tilde{B}_n} \tilde{A}_{a,s}. \tag{4.2}$$

Set $C_{a,s} = \{a, a+s \mod n, a+2s \mod n, a+3s \mod n, \cdots\}$. Then $C_{a,s} = \{a, a+s \mod n, \cdots, a+(\frac{n}{\gcd(s,n)}-1)s \mod n\}$ and $|C_{a,s}| = n/\gcd(s,n)$. Set

$$A_2 = \bigcup_{s|n, s\leq n/r, 1\leq a\leq s} \{\xi_i = 1, \forall i \in C_{a,s}\}, \tag{4.3}$$

where $s|n$ means that s is a divisor of n.

Lemma **4.1.** *It holds that*

$$\{W^{(n)} \geq r\} = A_1 \cup A_2. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. Put

$$W_s^{(n)} = \max_{1\leq i\leq n} W_{i,s}^{(n)},$$

which is the maximum length of arithmetic progressions mod n in Σ_n with difference s. For any $m \geq 0$, $\{\xi_a = 1, \xi_{a+s \mod n} = 1, \cdots, \xi_{a+ms \mod n} = 1\}$ if and only if $\{\xi_b = 1, \xi_{b+(n-s) \mod n} = 1, \cdots, \xi_{b+m(n-s) \mod s} = 1\}$, where $b =$

$a + ms \mod n$. In addition, $\gcd(s, n) = \gcd(n - s, n)$. Hence $W_s^{(n)} = W_{n-s}^{(n)}$ for all $1 \le s \le n$. Consequently,

$$W^{(n)} = \max_{1\le s\le n} W_s^{(n)} = \max_{1\le s\le [n/2]} W_s^{(n)}.$$

For any $1 \le a, b \le n$, $C_{a,s} \cap C_{b,s} = \emptyset$ or $C_{a,s} = C_{b,s}$. In addition $C_{a,s} = C_{b,s}$ if and only if $b = a + \gcd(s, n) \cdot k$ for some integer k. Thus $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ is the disjoint union of $C_{a,s}$ with $1 \le a \le \gcd(s, n)$. It follows that

$$W_s^{(n)} = \max_{1\le a\le \gcd(s,n)} \tilde{W}_{a,s}^{(n)}.$$

where $\tilde{W}_{a,s}^{(n)} = \max_{i\in C_{a,s}} W_{i,s}^{(n)}$. Note that $\{\tilde{W}_{a,s}^{(n)} \ge r\} = \{\xi_i = 1, \forall i \in C_{a,s}\}$ when $n/\gcd(s, n) = r$, and

$$\{\tilde{W}_{a,s}^{(n)} \ge r\} = (\bigcup_{i\in C_{a,s}} \tilde{A}_{i,s}) \bigcup \{\xi_i = 1, \forall i \in C_{a,s}\}.$$

provided $n/\gcd(s, n) > r$. Therefore

$$\{W^{(n)} \ge r\} = (\bigcup_{(i,s)\in \tilde{B}_n} \tilde{A}_{i,s}) \bigcup (\bigcup_{1\le a\le \gcd(s,n), 1\le s\le [\frac{n}{2}], \frac{n}{\gcd(s,n)} \ge r} \{\xi_i = 1, \forall i \in C_{a,s}\}).$$

This, together with the fact that $C_{a,s} = C_{a,\gcd(s,n)}$, yields (4.4). □

Let $\tilde{I} = \tilde{I}_{n,r} = \sum_{(a,s)\in \tilde{B}_n} P(\tilde{A}_{a,s})$. By Lemma (4.1), we have

$$P(A_1) \le P(W^{(n)} \ge r) \le P(A_1) + P(A_2) \le \tilde{I} + P(A_2). \tag{4.5}$$

Set

$$\tilde{B}_{a,s} = \tilde{B}_{a,s}^{(n,r)} = \{a, a + s \mod n, \cdots, a + rs \mod n\}. \tag{4.6}$$

Define $\tilde{G}$ to be the graph with vertex set $\tilde{B}_n$ and edges defined by $(a, s) \sim (b, t)$ if and only if $\tilde{B}_{a,s} \cap \tilde{B}_{b,t} \ne \emptyset$. Then $\tilde{G}$ is a dependency graph of $\{I_{\tilde{A}_{a,s}} : (a, s) \in \tilde{B}_n\}$. Put

$$\tilde{e}^{(n,r)} = \sum_{(a,s)\in \tilde{B}_n} \sum_{(b,t)\sim(a,s)} P(\tilde{A}_{a,s})P(\tilde{A}_{b,t}) + \sum_{(a,s)\in \tilde{B}_n} \sum_{(b,t)\sim(a,s),(b,t)\ne(a,s)} P(\tilde{A}_{a,s}\tilde{A}_{b,t}).$$

Then

$$|P(A_1^c) - e^{-\tilde{I}}| \leq \tilde{e}^{(n,r)}. \tag{4.7}$$

The estimations of $P(A_2)$, $\tilde{I}$ and $\tilde{e}^{(n,r)}$ are given in the following two lemmas.

Lemma **4.2.** *We have*

$$P(A_2) \leq \frac{np^r}{qr} \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$(1 - \frac{(r+1)^2}{2n})\frac{qn^2p^r}{2} \leq \tilde{I} \leq \frac{qn^2p^r}{2}. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. Obviously,

$$P(A_2) \ \leq \ \sum_{s|n, s\leq n/r} sp^{\frac{n}{s}} \leq \sum_{i=r}^{n} \frac{n}{i}p^i \leq \frac{n}{r}\sum_{i=r}^{n} p^i \leq \frac{np^r}{qr}.$$

Clearly, $\{1 \leq s \leq [\frac{n}{2}] : \gcd(n,s) \geq \frac{n}{r}\} \subseteq \{s = \frac{n}{i}j : 2 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq [\frac{i}{2}]\}$. It implies that

$$\frac{n^2}{2} \geq |B_n| \geq n([\frac{n}{2}] - \sum_{i=2}^{r}[\frac{i}{2}]) \geq \frac{n^2}{2}(1 - \frac{(r+1)^2}{2n}).$$

Now the fact that $\tilde{I} = |\tilde{B}_n|qp^r$ yields (4.9) immediately. □

Lemma **4.3.** *It holds that* $\tilde{e}^{(n,r)} \leq 4(n^3r^2p^{2r-1} + n^2r^5p^{\frac{3}{2}r-1} + nr^6p^r)$.

Proof. Let $H = \{(a,s,b,t) \in \tilde{B}_n \times \tilde{B}_n : (a,s) \sim (b,t)\}$, $\tilde{c}_1 = |H|$,

$$\tilde{c}_2 \ = \ |\{(a,s,b,t) \in H : |\tilde{B}_{a,s} \cap \tilde{B}_{b,t}| \geq 2\}|$$

and

$$\tilde{c}_3 = |\{(a,s,b,t) \in H : (a,s) \neq (b,t), |\tilde{B}_{a,s} \cap \tilde{B}_{b,t}| > \frac{r}{2} + 1, \tilde{A}_{a,s} \cap \tilde{A}_{b,t} \neq \emptyset\}|.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{c}_1 \le \quad & |\{(a,s,b,t) : (a,s) \in \tilde{B}_n, 1 \le t \le [\frac{n}{2}], b = a + is - jt \mod n,\\ & 0 \le i, j \le r\}| \le n^3 r^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Suppose that $|\tilde{B}_{a,s} \cap \tilde{B}_{b,t}| \ge 2$. Then there is $0 \le j_1 < j_2 \le r$ and $x, y \in \tilde{B}_{a,s}$ such that $b + j_1 t \mod n = x$ and $b + j_2 t \mod n = y$. Hence $(j_2 - j_1)t - kn = y - x$ for some $0 \le k \le j_2 - j_1$ and $b = x - j_1 t \mod n$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{c}_2 \le \quad & |\{(a,s,b,t) : (a,s) \in \tilde{B}_n, t = (kn + y - x)/i, b = x - jt \mod n,\\ & 1 \le i \le r, 0 \le j, k \le r, x, y \in \tilde{B}_{a,s}\}| \le 3n^2 r^5. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

We shall show that $\tilde{A}_{a,s} \cap \tilde{A}_{b,s} = \emptyset$ when $b \ne a$ and $(a,s) \sim (b,s)$. Let

$$j^* = \min\{0 \le j \le r : b + js \mod n \in \tilde{B}_{a,s}\}.$$

Then there is $0 \le i \le r$ such that $b + j^* s \mod n = a + is \mod n$. It follows that $b + (j^* - 1)s \mod n = a + (i-1)s \mod n$. Hence $j^* - 1 < 0$ or $i - 1 < 0$. If $j^* - 1 < 0$, then $j^* = 0$ and hence $b = a + is \mod n$. Since $b \ne a$, $i \ne 0$. We have $\tilde{A}_{a,s} \cap \tilde{A}_{b,s} \subseteq \{\xi_{a+is \mod n} = 1, \xi_b = 0\} = \{\xi_b = 1, \xi_b = 0\} = \emptyset$. Similarly $\tilde{A}_{a,s} \cap \tilde{A}_{b,s} = \emptyset$ when $i - 1 < 0$.

Suppose that $s \ne t$, $|\tilde{B}_{a,s} \cap \tilde{B}_{b,t}| > r/2 + 1$ and $|\tilde{B}_{a,s} \cap \tilde{B}_{b,t}| = \{a + i_0 s, a + i_1 s, \cdots, a + i_k s\}$ with $0 \le i_0 < i_1 < \cdots < i_k \le r$. Then there is l such that $i_{l+1} - i_l = 1$. Since $a + i_l s \mod n = b + j_1 \mod n$ and $a + i_{l+1} s \mod n = b + j_2 \mod n$ for some $0 \le j_1, j_2 \le r$ and $j_1 \ne j_2$, $s = it \mod n$ with $i = j_2 - j_1$. If $i = 1$, then $s = t$. If $i = -1$, then $s = n - t$ and hence $s = t = n/2$ by the fact that $1 \le s, t \le n/2$. The contradiction shows that $1 < |i| \le r$. Similarly, $t = js \mod n$ for some $1 < |j| \le r$. It follows that $s = ijs \mod n$, that is $(ij - 1)s = \jmath n$ for some $|\jmath| \le r^2/2$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{c}_3 \;\le\; & |\{(a,s,b,t) : s = \jmath n/(ij-1), t = js \mod n, b = a + ls - mt \mod n,\\ & 1 \le a \le n, 1 < |i|, |j| \le r, |\jmath| \le r^2/2, 0 \le l, m \le r\}| \le 4nr^6. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Thus our result holds by noting that $\tilde{e}^{(n,r)} \le 2\tilde{c}_1 p^{2r-1} + \tilde{c}_2 p^{\frac{3r}{2}-1} + \tilde{c}_3 p^r$. $\square$

Similarly, we may show that for any fixed m, n,

$$|\{(a,s,b,t) \in \tilde{B}_m^{(r_m)} \times \tilde{B}_n^{(r_n)} : |\tilde{B}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)} \cap \tilde{B}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)}| \ge 1\}| \le m^2 n r_m r_n \tag{4.13}$$

and

$$|\{(a,s,b,t) \in \tilde{B}_m^{(r_m)} \times \tilde{B}_n^{(r_n)} : |\tilde{B}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)} \cap \tilde{B}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)}| \ge 2\}| \le 3 m^2 r_m^2 r_n^3. \tag{4.14}$$

LEMMA **4.4.** *Suppose that* $(a,s) \in \tilde{B}_m^{(r_m)}$ *and* $(b,t) \in \tilde{B}_n^{(r_n)}$. *If* $n \ge 2m$, $r_n \ge 36$ *and* $t > 3n/r_n$, *then* $|\tilde{B}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)} \cap \tilde{B}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)}| < \frac{3}{4} r_n$.

Proof. If $1 \le x \le m$, $A = \{x, x+t, \cdots, x+kt\} \subseteq \{1,2,\cdots,n\}$ and $x+(k+1)t > n$, then $k \ge 1$ and $x + \frac{k+1}{2}t > n/2 \ge m$. Thus $|A \cap \{1,2,\cdots,m\}| \le (k+1)/2$ when k is odd, or $|A \cap \{1,2,\cdots,m\}| \le k/2+1$ when k is even. Hence $|A \cap \{1,2,\cdots,m\}|/|A| \le 2/3$. Since $t > 3n/r_n$, there is $h \ge 3$, $0 \le i_1 < i_2 < \cdots i_h < r_n$ such that $b+(i_1+1)t > n \ge b + i_1 t, b + (i_2+1)t > 2n \ge b + i_2 t, \cdots, b + (i_h+1)t > hn \ge b + i_h t$ and $b + r_n t \le (h+1)n$. Let $i_0 = -1$, $i_{h+1} = r_n$ and

$$A_j = \{b + (i_j+1)t \mod n, b + (i_j+2)t \mod n, \cdots, b + i_{j+1}t \mod n\}.$$

Then $|A_j \cap \{1,2,\cdots m\}| \le \frac{2}{3}|A_j|$ when $0 \le j \le h-1$, and $\jmath = |A_{h+1} \cap \{1,2\cdots,m\}| \le m/t+1$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &|\{b, b+t \mod n, \cdots, b+r_n t \mod n\} \cap \{1,2,\cdots,m\}|/r_n \\ &\le \frac{\frac{2}{3}\sum_{j=0}^{h-1}|A_j| + \jmath}{r_n} \le \frac{2(i_h+1+\jmath)}{3r_n} + \frac{\jmath}{3r_n} \le \frac{2}{3} + \frac{m}{3r_n t} + \frac{1}{r_n} < \frac{3}{4}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2 (1)Firstly, by (1.4) and (4.9),

$$|e^{-\tilde{I}_{n,r}} - e^{-\mu_{n,r}}| \le |\tilde{I}_{n,r} - \mu_{n,r}| \le qnp^r r^2. \tag{4.15}$$

Next, let $r_n = [\frac{-2\ln n}{\ln p} + \frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln p} + \frac{\ln 2 - \ln q}{\ln p} - 1]$ and $R_n = [\frac{-3\ln n}{\ln p}]$. Lemma 4.3, together with (4.5), (4.7), (4.8) and (4.15), yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{r_n \le r \le R_n} |P(W^{(n)} < r) - e^{-\mu_{n,r}}| \\
&\le \max_{r_n \le r \le R_n} |P(W^{(n)} < r) - e^{-\tilde{I}_{n,r}}| + \max_{r_n \le r \le R_n} |e^{-\tilde{I}_{n,r}} - e^{-\mu_{n,r}}| \\
&\le \max_{r_n \le r \le R_n} (\tilde{e}^{(n,r)} + \frac{np^r}{qr} + qnp^r r^2) \\
&= O(n^{-1}\ln^7 n). \qquad (4.16)
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it's easy to check that $e^{-\mu_{n,r_n}} = o(n^{-1})$ and $1 - e^{-\mu_{n,R_n}} = O(n^{-1})$. Therefore(1.11) holds by noting that $P(W^{(n)} < r)$ and $e^{-\mu_{n,r}}$ are both increasing functions of r.

(2) Let $r = C\ln n + x$. Then $\mu_{n,r} = qp^x/2$. Hence (1.11) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{x \ge D\ln\ln n + a, C\ln n + x \in \mathbb{Z}} |\exp(qp^x/2)P(W^{(n)} < C\ln n + x) - 1| \\
\le\ & \exp(qp^{D\ln\ln n + a}/2)O(\frac{\ln^7 n}{n}) = O(\frac{\ln^7 n}{n^{1-\frac{qp^a}{2}}}).
\end{aligned}$$

(3) In view of (1.11), it holds that

$$P(W^{(n)} < C\ln n + \varepsilon D\ln\ln n) = e^{-O(\ln^\varepsilon n)} + O(\frac{\ln^7 n}{n}) \to \begin{cases} 1, & \varepsilon < 0; \\ 0, & \varepsilon > 0. \end{cases}$$

It follows (1.13) immediately.

(4) In view of (1.1), to prove (1.2), it remains only to show that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(n)}}{C\ln n} \le \frac{3}{2} \ a.s.$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, by (4.5),(4.8) and (4.9),

$$P(W^{(n)} > (1+\varepsilon)C\ln n) \le O(n^{-2\varepsilon}) + O(\frac{n^{-1-2\varepsilon}}{\ln n}). \qquad (4.17)$$

Hence

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(W^{(n)} > (1+\varepsilon)C\ln n) < \infty$$

whenever $\varepsilon > \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(n)}}{C\ln n} \le \frac{3}{2}$ *a.s.* as desired.

Since $W^{(n)} \ge U^{(n)}$, by (1.8), to prove (1.14), we need only to show that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(n)} - C\ln n}{\ln\ln n} \le D \ \ a.s. \tag{4.18}$$

Fix any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Let $r_n = [C\ln n + \varepsilon D \ln\ln n]$, $H_n = \{W^{(n)} < r_n\}$ and $X_k = \sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} I_{H_n}$. Then

$$P(\bigcup_{n=k+1}^{2k} H_n) = P(X_k > 0) \ge \frac{(EX_k)^2}{EX_k^2} = \frac{(\sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} P(H_n))^2}{\sum_{m,n=k+1}^{2n} P(H_m H_n)}. \tag{4.19}$$

Clearly, $\mu_{n,r_n} = O(\ln^\varepsilon n) = o(\ln n/4)$. Together with (1.11), it implies that

$$\sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} P(H_n) \ge \sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} e^{-\mu_{n,r_n}} - O(\ln^7 k) \ge O(k^{3/4}). \tag{4.20}$$

Set $E_n = \{(a,s) : 1 \le a \le n, [\frac{3n}{C\ln n}] + 1 \le s \le [\frac{n}{2}], \gcd(n,s) < \frac{n}{r_n}\}$. By (4.2) and (4.4),

$$P((H_m H_n)^c) \ge P(\cup_{(a,s)\in E_m} \tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)} \cup_{(b,t)\in E_n} \tilde{A}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)}).$$

Let V be the graph with vertex set $V_k = \{(a,s,n) : k+1 \le n \le 2k, (a,s) \in E_n\}$ and edges defined by $(a,s,m) \sim (b,t,n)$ if and only if $\tilde{B}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)} \cap \tilde{B}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)} \ne \emptyset$. Then V is a dependency graph of $\{I_{\tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(n,r_n)}} : (a,s,n) \in V_k\}$. Let $J_m = \sum_{(a,s)\in E_m} P(\tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)})$. Then

$$P(H_m H_n) \le e^{-J_m - J_n} + \tilde{e}^{(m,r_m)} + \tilde{e}^{(n,r_n)} + 2\tilde{e}^{(m,r_m,n,r_n)}, \tag{4.21}$$

where $\tilde{e}^{(m,r_m,n,r_n)} = \sum_{(a,s,m)\sim(b,t,n)} \big(P(\tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)})P(\tilde{A}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)}) + P(\tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)}\tilde{A}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)})\big)$. It follows that

$$\sum_{m,n=k+1}^{2k} P(H_m H_n) \le (\sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} e^{-J_n})^2 + \mathcal{L}_k, \tag{4.22}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_k = 2k\sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} \tilde{e}^{(n,r_n)} + 2\sum_{m,n=k+1}^{2k} \tilde{e}^{(m,r_m,n,r_n)}$. One deduces from (4.9) that $J_n \geq \mu_{n,r_n}(1 - \frac{(r_n+1)^2}{2n} - \frac{6}{C\ln n})$. Hence

$$\sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} e^{-J_n} \leq e^{O(\ln^{\varepsilon-1} k)} \sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} e^{-\mu_{n,r_n}} \tag{4.23}$$

by noting that $\mu_{n,r_n} = O(\ln^{\varepsilon} n)$. If we have showed that $\mathcal{L}_k \leq O(k\ln^8 k)$, then $\lim_{k\to\infty} P(\bigcup_{n=k+1}^{2k} H_n) = 1$ and hence (4.18) holds, in view of (4.19)–(4.23).

Now we shall show that $\mathcal{L}_k \leq O(k\ln^8 k)$. By Lemma 4.3,

$$k\sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} \tilde{e}^{(n,r_n)} \leq O(k\ln^7 k).$$

Fix any $(a,s,m) \in V_k$, define $\gamma(a,s,m)$ to be the set of all triples $(b,t,n) \in V_k$ such that $|\tilde{B}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)} \cap \tilde{B}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)}| > C\ln(2k)/2$. Suppose that k is sufficiently large and $(b,t,n) \in \gamma(a,s,m)$. Let $i_l = \min\{j \geq 0 : b + jt > ln\}$, $\jmath = \max\{l : i_l \leq r_m\}$ and $Z_l = \{b + it - ln : i_l \leq i \leq min(i_{l+1} - 1, r_n)\}$. Then $\tilde{B}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)}$ is the disjoint union of Z_i with $0 \leq i \leq \jmath$. Since $[\frac{3n}{C\ln n}] + 1 \leq t \leq [\frac{n}{2}]$, $|Z_i| \leq C\ln n/3 + 1$ for all $i \leq \jmath$, and $|Z_i| \geq 2$ for $0 < i < \jmath$. Thus $|\tilde{B}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)}| = r_n + 1 \geq 2(\jmath - 1)$. It follows that $\jmath < C\ln(2k)/2 - 3$. Since $|\tilde{B}_{b,t}^{(n,r_n)} \cap \tilde{B}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)}| > C\ln(2k)/2$ and $|Z_i| \leq C\ln n/3 + 1$, there are l and $\imath$ such that $\imath \neq l$, $|Z_l \cap \tilde{B}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)}| \geq 2$ and $|Z_\imath \cap \tilde{B}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)}| \geq 1$. That is to say, there is $0 \leq i, j, \ell \leq r_n$ and $x, y, z \in \tilde{B}_{a,s,m}$ such that $b + it - ln = x$, $b + jt - ln = y$ and $b + \ell t - \imath n = z$. It leads to $(j - i)t = y - x$ and $(\imath - l)n = (\ell - i)t + x - z$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma(a,s,m)| \leq \quad & |\{(b,t,n) : t = (y-x)/i, n = (\ell t + x - z)/j, b + \imath t \mod n = x, \\ & |i|, |j|, |\ell|, |\imath| \leq C\ln 2k, i, j \neq 0, x, y, z \in \tilde{B}_{a,s,m}\}| = O(\ln^7 k). \end{aligned}$$

Combining with (4.13) and (4.14), one then deduces that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m,n=k+1}^{2k} \tilde{e}^{(m,r_m,n,r_n)} &\le \sum_{m,n=k+1}^{2k} \big(2p^{r_m+r_n-1}m^2 n r_m r_n + 3p^{r_m+r_n-C\ln(2k)/2}m^2 r_m^2 r_n^3\big)\\ &\quad + \sum_{(a,s,m)\in V_k} p^{r_m}|\gamma(a,s,m)| \le O(k\ln^8 k)\end{aligned}$$

as desired. It completes the proof of (1.14).

(5) Now we come to the proof of (1.15). By (1.11), for any $0<\varepsilon<1$,

$$P(W^{(2^n)} < C\ln 2^n + \varepsilon D\ln\ln 2^n) = e^{-O(n^{\varepsilon})}$$

and

$$P(W^{(2^n)} > C\ln 2^n - (1+\varepsilon)D\ln\ln 2^n) = O(n^{-(1+\varepsilon)}).$$

Hence $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(2^n)}-C\ln 2^n}{\ln\ln 2^n} \ge 0$ and $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(2^n)}-C\ln 2^n}{\ln\ln 2^n} \le -D$ by the Borel-Cantelli Lemma. In view of (1.13), it remains only to show that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{W^{(2^n)} - C\ln 2^n}{\ln\ln 2^n} \ge -D. \tag{4.24}$$

For any $0<\varepsilon<1$, let $r_n = [C\ln n - \varepsilon D\ln\ln n]$ and $F_n = \{(a,s) : 1 \le a \le n, 3n/r_n < s \le [n/2], \gcd(n,s) < n/r_n\}$. To show (4.24), it suffices to show that $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\bigcup_{n=k+1}^{2k}\{W^{(2^n)} \ge r_{2^n}\}) = 1$. It need only to show that $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\bigcup_{(a,s,m)\in G_k} \tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)}) = 1$, where $G_k = \{(a,s,2^n) : k+1 \le n \le 2k, (a,s)\in F_{2^n}\}$. Let $X_k = \sum_{(a,s,m)\in G_k} I_{\tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)}}$. Clearly $EX_k = O(k^{1-\varepsilon})$. By Lemma 4.3, Lemma 4.4, (4.13) and (4.14),

$$\begin{aligned}DX_k &\le \sum_{(a,s,m)\in G_k} P(\tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)}) + 2\sum_{n=k+1}^{2k} \tilde{e}^{(2^n,r_{2^n})}\\ &\quad +2\sum_{k+1\le m<n\le 2k} (p^{r_{2^m}+r_{2^n}-1}2^{2m}2^n r_{2^m} r_{2^n} + 3p^{r_{2^m}+\frac{1}{4}r_{2^n}}2^{2m} r_{2^m}^2 r_{2^n}^3)\\ &= O(k^{1-\varepsilon}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$P(\bigcup_{(a,s,m)\in G_k} \tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(m,r_m)}) = P(X_k > 0) \geq \frac{(EX_k)^2}{DX_k + (EX_k)^2} \to 1.$$

As to (1.16), by Proposition 2.2, we need only to show (2.8). It suffices to show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{(a,s)\in F_{2^k}} I_{\tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(2^k, r_{2^k})}} = 0 \ a.s. \tag{4.25}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} I_{H_k} = 0 \ a.s., \tag{4.26}$$

where $H_k = \{W^{(2^k)} \geq r_{2^k}\} \setminus (\bigcup_{(a,s)\in F_{2^k}} \tilde{A}_{a,s}^{(2^k, r_{2^k})})$. Similar as the proof of (2.6), we may show (4.25). Note that $P(H_k) = O(k^{-1-\varepsilon})$. By Borel-Cantelli Lemma, $\lim_{k\to\infty} I_{H_k} = 0 \ a.s.$ It follows (4.26) and completes our proof. $\square$

5 The asymptotic distributions when $p_n = o(1)$

Proof of Theorem 1.3 (i) Set $q_n = 1 - p_n$ and $r_n = [\frac{2\ln n}{-\ln p_n} + \frac{\ln\ln n}{\ln p_n}]$. Clearly, $p_n^{r_n+1} \leq n^{-2}\ln n \leq p_n^{r_n}$. Similar as the proof of (3.10), we may show that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\max_{0\leq k\leq 2} |P(U^{(n,p_n)} < r_n + k) - e^{-\lambda_{n,r_n+k,p_n}}| \leq c p_n^{-3} n^{-1} \ln^2 n. \tag{5.1}$$

Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{2\ln n}{-\ln p_n} = \infty$, $\frac{\ln n}{-\ln p_n} \geq 10$ and hence $p_n^{-1} \leq n^{0.1}$ for sufficiently large n. This, together with (5.1) implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \max_{0\leq k\leq 2} |P(U^{(n,p_n)} < r_n + k) - e^{-\lambda_{n,r_n+k,p_n}}| = 0. \tag{5.2}$$

In addition,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_{n,r_n,p_n} \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{q_n \ln n}{2(r_n - 1)} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-\ln p_n}{4} = \infty \tag{5.3}$$

by noting that $p_n \to 0$. Similarly,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_{n,r_n+2,p_n} \le \lim_{n\to\infty} (\frac{p_n^2 \ln^2 p_n}{8 \ln n} - \frac{p_n \ln p_n}{4}) = 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Therefore (1.18) holds by (5.2)–(5.4). Use the same method, we may prove (1.19) and complete the proof of (i).

(ii)(iii): Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} np_n = \infty$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^{(n)} \ge 2) = 1$ and hence

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(U^{(n,p_n)} \ge 2) = 1. \tag{5.5}$$

Choose an $0 < \varepsilon < 0.1$ such that $[b-\varepsilon, b) \cup (b, b+\varepsilon)$ contains no integers. There is N such that $\frac{b-\varepsilon}{2} < \ln n/(-\ln p_n) < \frac{b+\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $n > N$. It follows that for all $n > N$,

$$p_n^{\frac{-b+\varepsilon}{2}} < n < p_n^{\frac{-b-\varepsilon}{2}}. \tag{5.6}$$

By (4.5), (5.6) and Lemma 4.2, for $n > N$,

$$P(W^{(n,p_n)} \ge [b]+1) \le \frac{p_n^{[b]+1-b/2-\varepsilon/2}}{q_n([b]+1])} + \frac{q_n p_n^{[b]+1-b-\varepsilon}}{2} \to 0. \tag{5.7}$$

Suppose that $r < b \le r+1$ where r is a positive integer. By (5.6), $n^2 p_n^r \ge p_n^{r-(b-\varepsilon)} \to \infty$. Let $X_n = \sum_{(a,s)\in B_n^{(r)}} I_{A_{a,s}^{(r)}}$. By Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, $EX_n = O(n^2 p_n^r)$ and $DX_n \le EX_n + O(n^3 p_n^{2r-1}) = o\big((EX_n)^2\big)$. Consequently,

$$P(U^{(n,p_n)} \ge r) = P(X_n \ge 0) \ge \frac{(EX_n)^2}{DX_n + (EX_n)^2} \to 1. \tag{5.8}$$

Similar as the proof of (3.10) and (4.16), by using (5.6),we may show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |P(U^{(n,p_n)} < b) - e^{-\lambda_{n,b,p_n}}| = \lim_{n\to\infty} |P(W^{(n,p_n)} < b) - e^{-\mu_{n,b,p_n}}| = 0 \tag{5.9}$$

when $b \ge 3$ and b is an integer. Furthermore, if $u = \lim_{n\to\infty} n^2 p_n^b \le \infty$ exists, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(U^{((n,p_n)} < b) = \lim_{n\to\infty} e^{-\lambda_{n,b,p_n}} = e^{-\frac{u}{2(b-1)}} \tag{5.10}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(W^{(n,p_n)} < b) = \lim_{n\to\infty} e^{-\mu_{n,b,p_n}} = e^{-\frac{u}{2}}. \tag{5.11}$$

Thus our result holds by (5.5),(5.7),(5.8),(5.10), (5.11) and by noting that $W^{(n,p_n)} \geq U^{(n,p_n)}$. $\square$

References

[1] Alon, N. and Spencer, J.H. (2000). *The probabilistic method.* John Wiley & Sons. New York.

[2] Arratia, R., Goldstein, L. and Gordon, L. (1989). Two moments suffice for poisson approximations: the chen-stein method. *Ann. Probab.* **17**, 9-25.

[3] Barbour, A. D. and Chen, L. (2005). An introduction to Stein's method. *Lecture Notes Series* **4**, Institute for Mathematical Sciences, National University of Singapore.

[4] Benjamini, I., Yadin, A. and Zeitouni, O. (2007). Maximal arithmetic progressions in random subsets. *Elec. Comm. in Probab.* **12**, 365-376.

[5] Erdös, P. and Rényi, A. (1970). On a new law of large numbers. *J. Analyse Math.* **23**, 103-111.

[6] Erdös, P. and Revesz, P. (1977). On the length of the longest head-run. *Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai* **16**, 219-228.

[7] Gordon, L., Schilling, M. F. and Waterman, M. S. (1986). An extreme value theory for long head runs. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **72**, 279-287.

[8] József T. (2009). Limit theorems for the longest run. *Annales Mathematicae et Informaticae* **36**, 133-141.

[9] Móri, T. F. (1993). The a.s. limit distribution of the longest head run. *Can. J. Math.* **45**, No. 6, 1245-1262.

[10] Tao, T. (2007). What is good mathematics? *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* **44**, No. 4, 623-634.